B. ~~Law~~

App. F. IX-4

1928.29

Previous References (Law)

File No. 84-28

Serial Nos. 1-18

P

Later References
Law 5-28, 17 of 18.
" 7-28, 1-3
" 1159-30, 11 of 12

(43)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. [illegible]

Part B for March 1929

SUBJECT

O.S. No. 179 1928-29 filed by Nagappachar re. management of Sri Kalikamba Temple Kanchipuram.

File 6

B. Gen. Sec. 15/3/29.

G.R.S. III—3]

III G.H.P

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

D. 1112

2477
24.1.29

Notice from the Dist" Judge, Mysore, in O. S. no. 179 of 1928-9 filed by Nagappa praying that he may be recognized as the hereditary manager of Kalikamba temple in Srirangapatana, and left in the management of the instn—

Mus. T. no. 22—26 on the subject of Instn— No G. of July 1927 and Decemb. assuming the management of the on the subject, are flag

The Opp. may be sent to Prof. Br. for taking further action & depos the suit.

The suit stands post to 4—2—1929

Submr

24.1.29

Yes

24/1

24/1

24/1

24/1

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or else pasted on this form.

44 80

O.S. 1705 of 28-29, District Court, Mysore
D2408 (Nagathachari is Petr.
three managers of Sri Kalikamba Temple
Srirangapatna

General and Revenue Secretariat

Law File No. 84 of 1928. (2

App. F. III—2]

Serial No.

Sus Regd 32

The receipt of the notice may be acknowledged and the P'pr. required to appear and obtain an adjt. and send up a draft written statement in due course for approval

(L—R')

Law 25/1

25/1/29

yes

Draft

25/1

Drafts - one to Dist Judge, Mysore & another to PPr, Mysore - put up.

DRP 26.1.29

26/1

2. To The District Judge, Mysore
P 3908/ dated 26.1.29
acknowledging the receipt of the Summons.

3. To, The PPr, Mysore
P 3909/ Law dated 26.1.29
requesting him to appear & put in & take an adjt for filing defence which he should prepare & send for opinion & approval

Sus A
DRP
28/1/29

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 021—GPB—30,000—21-8-28

Serial No.	
4	no 784 of 26.1.29 Notice of an appln for injunction petd by the Plaintiff in the case Draft letter to PPr, mysore forwarding copy of the petition and instructing him to oppose the application put up for approval. Mus File 22 of 1926 placed below, may perhaps be sent to the PPr for preparing the W.S as well as the Objns to the petition. RDY 28.1.29 (L.R.) 29/1 Issue 29/1 29/1
5	To. the Public Prosecutor, mysore P 6016/Law 84-28-5 dated 30-1-29. forwarding notice of applⁿ under order 39 rule 2 & instructing him to oppose the same & sending Mus File 22 of 1926 Serials Nos 1 to 12.-
6	From PPr, mysore No 375 of 28.29 dated 29/30 Jan 29 requesting to send the whole file of records in the Office of the Dy Commr Officer I.R. Dn or Taluk Office Seringapatam- The available records here viz Mus File 22 of 1926 has been sent to the PPr already Draft letter to D.C mysore requesting him to send the records reqd now in the P.O.D, to the PPr, Mysore RDY 1.2.29 (L.R.)

NOTE – Contn. sheet

GPB—30,000—21-8-28

3514 3246 of 27 Attachments

4

[pp F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

Law File No. 84 of 1928

Serial No.	
1	To, the Deputy Con[troller] mysore P 4101 dated ? 29 Requesting him to send his reg[ar]d records to PPr Mysore.
6	Letter No: 478/28-29 dated 11/29 from the Public Prosecutor Mysore, intimating that there is no legal Obj[ection] for his appearing for first in the case O.S. 17 of 28.29 & forwarding Vakalats for Ch: Secy's signature, in O. 17 & 18 respectively & praying that Rs 6/- may be sent to him for incidental expenses connected with the two suits.
9	Letter No: 433 of 28-29 dated 11-2-29 from the PPr, informing that O.S. 17 & 18 have been posted to 15.2.29 and 4.3.29 respectively. Action as regards O.S. 18 will be taken in the file pertaining to it, which is now sent to Huz Br for putting up the connected papers. Re: O.S. 17. which is posted to 15.2.29, the Vakalat has to be signed by the Chief Secretary and a total sum of Rs 6/- has to be sent to the PPr together with a copy of the Reg VII of 1927. Since the two suits O.S. 17 & 18 are connected with the Nuzvai Dept, the D.C. mysore

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 021—GPB—30,000—21-8-28

Serial No.

with, if approved, be requested to place the sum of Rs 6/- at the disposal of the PPr, Mysore. Drafts to DC. & PPr Mysore put up for orders.

Date of Hg of D. 17 28/29 is 15-2-29

Mpf 13.2.29

L.R.)

13/2 Asstt 13/2 13/2

10 To the Dy Comr, Mysore
P 4411 dated 13.2.29
requesting him to pay Rs 3/- to PPr for incidental charges connected with D. 17 of 28.29.

10 To the Deputy Comr, Hassan.
P 4412 dated 13.2.29
Requesting him to pay Rs 3/- to PPr for incidental charges connected with D. 18 of 28.29

11 To the PPr, Mysore
P 4413, dated 13.2.29
forwarding Vakalati & Reg VII of 1927 intimating that DC's Mysore & Hassan have been requested to pay him Rs 3/- each

Asstt Mpf 14/2/29

NOTE—Contn. sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat

Law File No. 84 of 1928

App F. III—2

Serial No.	
12	Letter No. H.586/28 dated 20th Feb 1928 from the D.C. Mysore forwarding copies of letters to the Govt regarding the above suit. The D.C. informs the Govt of having sent the records to PPr Mysore as per instructions issued from this office — ~~subject~~ for perusal. The PPr has been requested to prepare & send a draft w.s. & the same is being awaited. BNP 25/2/29
13	Letter No. 460 of 28-29 dated 23.2.29 from the Public Prosecutor, Mysore forwarding a draft W.S. for signature of Ch Secy & Approval of L.R. The suit is posted to 28.2.29 for filing the W.S. The PPr has not sent the Govt file 22-26 Sls 1 to 12 forwarded to him for preparing the W.S. In its absence it is difficult to pronounce an opinion as regards the facts alleged to in the W.S. The ~~main~~ points as to non-maintainability of the suit under Reg VII of 1927 and it having been barred by time, seem all right. Under rule 93, the PPr has to forward the draft W.S. to L.R for approval & not direct to the Ch.Secy or Govt & pray the approval of L.R; and he should have done this ~~in time~~ earlier so as to give enough time for scrutiny etc. BNP 25/2/29

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 021—GPB—30,000—21-8-28

Serial No.

The Pub: Prosr may be required (1) to state why he has forwarded the W/s to the Chief Secy instead of to the Govt. as per rules to which his attention may be drawn;
(2) Why he has omitted to send the records;
(3) Why he has delayed till the 24th inst
(4) to send the Records & move for and adjt to file W/s &c.

D. M. 25/2

Draft perused
MM
26.2.29

Phano desires to say
D. M. 26/2
2
26/2

14 To The Public Prosecutor, Mysore
P 4817 dated 26.2.29
enquiring why he has not followed the procedure prescribed in rule 93 & requesting him to get an adjournment on 28th inst & to send the records for Scrutiny of the written statement &c.

Sub A
MM
27.2.29

15 Letter No 477 of 28.2.29 dated 28th Febr 1929 from the Public Prosecutor, Mysore, forwarding records asked for and explaining the cause for the delay in submitting the draft W.S. for approval - and why he could

NOTE—Contn. sheet

3958

App. F. III- -,

General and Revenue Secretariat. Case File No. 84 of 1928.

Serial No.	
	the Secretariat to the Chief Secy Direct.
	The plaint is flagged N, & the additional statement of facts to be included in an amended plaint as N_2. The W.S. drafted by PPr is flagged X.
	Flag P in the collection placed below gives the facts of the case. Flags I & J. are Govt orders appointing the Committee of Dharmadarsis etc, which are now being challenged in Suit.
	Submitted for approval of the W. statement
	Dated of Hg 7.3.29
	Dnf 2/3/29 Chief Secy with Compliments for Signature. P.M. 5/3
	A fresh aft-cd. S as directed is prepared placed below Dnf 4.3.29 / Draft do to Ch Secy below to PPr for put up as instructed Dnf 5/3/29 Signed P.M. 5/3
16	To the Public Prosecutor, Mysore P 4923 / 5.3.29 intimating that the W.S. is sent to Ch Secy now camping at Mysore & that it would be returned to him direct there as
17	Do, the Chief Secy. D.O. P 4924 / 5.3.29 requesting signature to the W.S & return of the same with records to PPr Mysore

Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—80,000—18-4-28

App. F. III—2}.

General and Revenue Secretariat. da. File No. 84 of 1929.

Serial No.	
14	Letter No Camp 17/CB. of 6.3.29 from Chief Secy intimating that the W.S. with the records as desired have been forwarded to POR at Mysore —

B+Sus
Rom
15/3.

NOTE—Contin. Sheet.

3248/P

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE AT MYSORE.

O.S.No: 17 of 1928-29.

Plaintiff. **Defendant.**

Nagappachari. The Government of Mysore by Chief Secretary, Bangalore.

SECRETARIAT MUZRAI D 1112 Memo 266-28-1

To

The Chief Secretary,
to the Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Muzrai (Protection) 22/1/29

Sir,

22 JAN. 1929

Whereas the abovenamed plaintiff has filed a suit against you a copy of which herewith sent for your information, I have the honour to state that the said suit stands posted to 4th February 1929 and to request that you will be pleased to make it convenient to appear before this court at 11 A.M. on that date either in person or by a Pleader duly instructed and enable to answer all material questions relating to the suit and to cause production on that day all the documents upon which you intend to rely in support of your defence. In default of such appearance on the said date the matter will be decided in your absence. I request that the receipt of this may be kindly acknowledged.

DISTRICT & SESSIONS COURT, MYSORE DIVISION.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

District Judge,
Mysore Dn.

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE, MYSORE DIVISION,

M Y S O R E.

O.S. No....17....of 1928 - 29.

Plaintiff:- Nagappachari, aged 56 years, son of Subbachari, Goldsmith and merchant residing in Benkinawab Street, Mandi Mohalla, Mysore.

Vs.

Defendant:- The Government of Mysore, by Chief Secretary, Bangalore.

MG 4²/29.

UNDER S. 80 AND O. VII R.I.C.P.C. III of 1911.

The plaintiff begs to state and pray as follows:-

1. Sri Kalikamba Temple at Seringapatam, whatever may be the history of the Temple earlier, was vested under the management of Sonar Rangaiya by His Highness the Maharaja Sri Krishnarajendra Wodeyar Bahadur III under Sannad dated 21-5-1826 and had been since under the direct and sole management of the direct male descendants of Sonar Rangaiya's family till 1910.

2. In 1910, the last male descendant Puttachari having no male issue and consequently on failure of the direct male line, the management fell on the admitted next nearest agnate line, the plaintiff.

In order to avoid disturbance and contention between the other cognate and agnate heirs of Sonar Rangaiya, the said Puttachari executed a Registered deed dated 17-2-1910. Thereafter the management of the Temple was being looked after very smoothly and without any inconvenience whatever.

3. After some years; one Mariachari of Seringapatam with evil motive and false representations has been making all attempts to oust the family of Sonar Rangaiya, from the hereditary management of the Temple.

4. On his attempts and after several stages, the Government have passed orders on 2-12-1927, directing the management to vest in a Committee of 5 Dharmadarsis of whom the plaintiff Nagappachari to be the convenor of the I Committee and the term of the Committee being fixed at 5 years. This is directly opposed to S. 13 (b) VIII of the R & C Institutions Regulation VII of 1927.

5. This order has directly defeated the spirit and working of the ancient Sannad and long custom and practice and established right of hereditary management of Temple by Sonar Rangaiya's family. The change in the administration was not at all necessitated and is contrary to Ss 13 and 35 of the above Regulation. The plaintiff was neither misbehaving nor incompetent. He is ever eager to discharge the pious and devoted duty which has been handed down to him in succession in his family. So the change in administration has worked immense

injury to plaintiff and his family. The Governments' interfering and assuming management is not valid in law.

6. So as nearest agnate descendant in the family of Sonar Rangaiya, as can be made known in the Geneological Tree given i.e.,

LINGACHARI.

Nanjundachari.	Sonar Rangiya
Venkatakrishnaiya.	Venkataramanuja
Subbachari.	Puttachari.
Nagappachari (Plaintiff)	

and in the presence of the established practice and custom of hereditary management of the said Temple the plaintiff is entitled to be the Manager which legal right is recognised under the R & C Institutions Regulation as stated in S 34, in preference to the Government Order passed. Since the Government order has aggrieved him, has denied him the above legal right and has threatened to divest him of this legal right of hereditary management the plaintiff has an imminent cause of action to file a suit for declaration to establish the customary right of hereditary sole management and restrain the Government from disturbing the plaintiff in the peaceful discharge of the duties under the legal and hereditary right of management. In accordance with S. 34 R & C Institutions Regulation the hereditary sole management has been established successively for more than three generations in the same family and as such the Government has no

5

ight to assume or alter the management as stated in S. 35 of the said Regulation.

7. Such cause of action has arisen from the date of Order i.e., 2-12-27 as set forth in para IV above. The plaintiff alone with another cousin agnate had filed a petition under Section 92 C.P.C. for permission to sue before the District Judge, Mysore for a declaration to direct a scheme establishing the old custom and practice of hereditary management of Temple but the Deputy Commissioner refused on 4-10-28 to grant sanction to file such a suit while other remedies were open; cause of action runs since that date i.e., 4-10-28 also. Notice under S. 80 C.P.C. had been issued to Chief Secretary, to Government, Bangalore, giving two months time for redress in the matter but since no redress was given the plaintiff was driven to file this suit.

8. A. Jurisdiction:- Principal Civil Court of original jurisdiction having jurisdiction over Seringapatam Temple is the District Judge's Court Mysore. Hence suit is within the jurisdiction of this Court.

B. Court Fee:- Declaration of the plaintiff's right of hereditary management and consequently to restrain Government from interferance value of injunction as a consequential relief is Rs. 100/- Stamp 10/-.

9. Prayer for Judgment. The Plaintiff prays that:-

(1) Under section 42 Specific Relief Act, in accordance with the ancient custom of hereditary right

of management of the said Sri Kalikamba Temple the Court may be pleased to declare that plaintiff is the sole hereditary manager of the said temple.

(2) Under Section 54 Specific Relief Act, on the basis of the above relief that Government be restrained by injunction that plaintiff should not be disturbed in the peaceful enjoyment of this right of hereditary management of the said Temple.

(3) Costs of suit and such other reliefs as are necessary may be decreed in plaintiff's favour against the defendant.

10. Under O. VII R. 19 the Plaintiff's address is given above in plaint for the purpose of service of all processes.

Signature verified by Pleader

I solemnly declare that all that is stated in Paras I to X are known to me and are true to the best of my knowledge and belief in the matter. I swear. Mysore 20-12-1928.

M.S. Pleader 4/29

APPENDIX F G—1

7

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

.....

Section law

File No. 84-26

Serial No. 2

No. P. 390

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

The District Judge,

Mysore.

Date of issue 26.1.29

Signed by M.L.N.

Sir,

I ~~am directed~~ write to acknowledge receipt of the Summons and copy of the plaint ~~received~~ in O.S. 17 of 1926-29 ~~on the file~~ (Nagappachar vs Government).

I have etc

for Secy to Govt

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

Appendix F C –1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Law

File No. [illegible]

Serial No. 3

No. P. 3909/Secl.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

The Public Prosecutor

Mysore.

Date of issue 26.1.29

Signed by .....

Sir,

I am directed to request you to appear on behalf of the ~~plaintiff~~ defendant viz Govt of Mysore by Chief Secretary in O.S. 17 of 1928-29 on the file of the ~~Civil~~ District Court, Mysore, which stands posted to 4th February 1929. The copy of the plaint is sent herewith and you are requested to obtain an adjournment and send up a draft written statement

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

in due course for approval.

Thaveek

for Secretary
Law

1000
26.1.79

XX No. 984 dt 26th Jan. 1929.

3314/928

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE MYSORE DIVISION.

O. S. No: 17 of 1927-28.

Plaintiff.		Defendant.
S.Nagappachari.	Vs.	The Government of Mysore by Chief Secretary, Bangalore.

To

The Chief Secretary

to the Government of Mysore,

Bangalore.

CHIEF SECRETARY. 28 JAN. 1929

Sir,

I have the honour to state that the abovenamed Plaintiff has made an application (copy enclosed) to this Court and to request you to make it convenient for you to appear in this Court in person or by a Pleader duly - - - instructed on the 4th day of February 1929 at 11 O'clock in the forenoon, to show cause against the application failing ~~failing~~ wherein the said application will be heard and determined exparte.

DISTRICT & SESSIONS COURT, MYSORE DIVISION.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

District Judge.

10.

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE, MYSORE.

O.S. No. 1, of 1928-29.

Plaintiff. Defendant.

S. Nagappachari. Vs. Government (Chief Secretary, Bangalore.)

Plaintiff's application under O. 39. R.2 Hearing 4/2/29.

I. The Plaintiff has filed the above suit to restrain the defendant from disturbing the plaintiff's peaceful enjoyment of the right of hereditary sole management of Sri Kalikamba Temple at Seringapatam,

II. The main grounds for an order to restrain the defendant are set forth in detail in the plaint.

III. There is no reason to disturb the plaintiff since the management is being honestly and diligently attended to by the plaintiff.

IV. The Defendant has been demanding, surrender of the right of management which is not legal according to Ss. 13 (b) (VIII) and 35 of the R & C. In Regn. VII 1927.

V. It will work great hardship and immense mental agony to the plaintiff to surrender the sole hereditary management which plaintiff considers to be his most dutiful and pious obligation transmitted to him in succession in his family. No amount of compensation and consolation will recoup the injury caused by the surrender of this right.

VI. Hence for the above submitted valid reasons, this Honourable Court may be pleased in the interests of justice, to pass an interim order restoring the the defendant from disturbing the plaintiff in the enjoyment of the said right of management.

Dated: 6/1/1929.

Copy.

11

Appendix F 6 –1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

Date of issue 30-1-29

Signed by

List of enclosures.....

Copied by

Examined by.....

Section Law

File No. 84-28

Serial No. 5

No. P. 4046 / 1 file 1 cutg.

Tw 84-28

To

The Public Prosecutor
Mysore.

Sir,

In connection with this office letter No. P 3909 dated 26th Jan 1929, regarding C.S. 17 of 28-29 on the file of the District Court, Mysore, I am directed to forward herewith Copy of an application under order 39 rule 2 C.P.C filed in the Case by the Plaintiff, the hearing of which is fixed to 4th Febr 1929, and to You are requested you to oppose the application.

over

WD 0399—GPB—20.000—18-9-28

The connected file of papers
(Muzarai 22 of 1926 Serials 1 to 12)
is herewith sent for your preparing
a draft written Statement as well
as Objections to the petition -
The same may be returned
to this office with the drafts
~~as aforesaid~~ in due Course

I have ek

for Secy to Govt
Mny Law
28/1/29
Advt

3394 12
P 828

Loan 84-28-b

WD 546-GBB-80,000-4-9-8

192 8-1929.

From

The Public Prosecutor and
Government Pleader, Lahore Division,
L A H O R E.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government
of Punjab, Lahore.

Dated 30th January 1929.

Despatched 30

Received

General No. 395 /28-29
No.

Enclosure No.

Punjab
CHIEF SECRETARY
31 JAN. 1929

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Secretary to Government, Law Department writes to me in his Office letter no: F. 390/Law dated 25th instant to appear on your behalf in C.S. No: 17 of 28-C (Mst. Fatima VS. Government of Lahore by Chief Secretary) which comes on for hearing on the 4th proximo but as an adjournment for filing the defence will work in the case.

On perusal of the plaint, I recollect that I must have conducted the temple case on behalf of Mst. Fatima before Sub-Divisional officer French locks, as a privy to legal practitioner. I request therefore that arrangements may kindly be made to send me the whole file of records of the case in order to enable me to verify my recollection before accepting the present brief on behalf of

Government.

The said records must be either in the Sub Division Office, French Rocks or the Field Office at Seringapatam. On receipt of the records I shall peruse them and send my opinion.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Public Prosecutor & Govt.Pleader.

Mysore Division.

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Law

File No. 84-28

Serial No. 7

No. P 4101

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore.

Date of issue 2/2/29

Signed by Sd. V. Sitharamaiya

Sir,

I am directed to request you to kindly ~~send~~ immediately send to the Public Prosecutor the whole file of records relating to the management of the Sri Kalikamba Temple in Seringapatam, ~~immediately~~, so as to enable him to appear on behalf of Govt in O.S. 17 of 28-29 (nagappachari v Government) on the file of the District Judge, Mysore, on the 4th February 1929.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

Have ok

W for Secy to Govt

Dy Secy Law Dept

1.2.29

Copy to Public Prosecutor, Mysore,
with ref: to his no: 395-97 28.29
dated 29/30 Jan 1929.

3569 14

WD 546—GRB—60,000—4-9-28

192

From
The Public Prosecutor and
Govt. pleader, Mysore

To
The Chief Secretary
to the Government of Mysore
Bangalore

Dated 11-2-29

Despatched

Received

General No. 428/28-29
No.

Enclosure No. 2 Vakalat
namah

Sir, I have the honour to inform you that O.S. no 17/28-
(Nagaffachari & Chief Secretary
came on for hearing on
4-2-29. On that date I took
time to find out after
perusal of records if there
were any legal impediment
for my appearing on behalf
of Government in the suit
above noted. On perusal
the records sent I find
that there can be no legal
objection for my accepting
the brief on behalf of
Government. So I send
a Vakalat form to be
returned after signature.
I shall let you know the
date of adjournment and
shall also take care to
send you the draft of the
written statement that

I propose to file in the case for Your acceptance and signature.

Regarding O.S. no 18/28-29 (Nagarajiah & others & Govt. of Mysore and Sree Nemi Sagara Swamy Sravana Belagola) I shall undertake to appear on behalf of Government. The adjourned date will be duly intimated to you. A vakalat is also sent for your signature and return. Records pertaining to this case may be sent.

I have in my office only a Gazette copy of the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institution Bill embodying the report of the select Committee I very much wish you will please direct immediate despatch of Regulation VII of 1927 pertaining to Religious and Charitable Institutions in Mysore.

A sum of Rs 6/- may also be sent to meet the incidental expenses of the two suits above referred to.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
[signature]
Public Prosecutor & Govt. pleader, Mysore

3570 Jr8
P 15

WD 546 – GPB – 50,000 – 4-9-28

192

From
The Public Prosecutor &
Govt pleader, Mysore

To
The Chief Secretary
to the Govt. of Mysore
Bangalore

Dated 11-2-29

Despatched

Received 12 FEB. 1929

CHIEF SECRETARY

General No. 433/28 W 29

No.

Enclosure No.

Sir,

In continuation of my office letter no 428/28-29 of this day, I have the honour to inform You that Os. nos 17/28-29 and 18/28-29 which were for hearing today in the District judge's court have been adjourned to 15th inst and 4th proxime respectively

The draft written statements in both the cases will be prepared and sent to You within a short time

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

public Prosecutor &
Govt. pleader Mysore

Appendix F C—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

Date of issue 13/2/29

Signed by Mr NS

Section ... new

File No. 64-26

Serial No.

No. 4411-12

To

(1) The Deputy Commissioner Mysore.

(2) The Dy. Com^r Hassan &c-

Sir,

I am directed to request you to place at the disposal of the Public Prosecutor, Mysore, a sum of Rs 3 (three) only which he requires to meet the incidental expenses connected with (1) O.S. 17/28-29 (2) C.C. 18/28-29 of the file of the District Court, Mysore ~~both the Suits the Muzarai Department being concerned in both the Suits.~~

I have etc

over

for Secy to Govt

13-2-29

(*) Nagappachari vs. Govt

(**) Nagarajaiya & others vs. Govt & Sri Venkatramanaswami

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

17

Appendix F G–1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. J 4413 Encl

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

The Public Prosecutor
Mysore

Date of issue 13/2/79

Signed by

Sir,

With reference to your letters Nos: 428 and 433 of 28.29 dated 11th Febr 1979, regarding O.S. 17 418 of 28.29 on the file of the District Court, Mysore, I am directed to return herewith the Vakalats duly signed by the Chief Secretary, the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore + Horsley, have been requested to place a sum of Rs 3/- each at your disposal to meet the incidental expenses

over

The name of the Pleader added in the vakalatnamas is omitted

List of enclosures.....

Copied by

Examined by.....

in the two Suits.

The records pertaining to the appointment of the Swami of the Jain mutt at Shravanabelgola which is ~~being litigated in~~ the subject-matter of O.S. 18 of 28-29 ~~and~~ will be sent to you ~~in due course,~~ later on. ~~along~~ A copy of Regulation VII of 1927 is enclosed herewith.

I have etc

D.M. 13/2

for Legal Remembrancer & Secy to Govt

DMP 13-2-29

16 3795 28

No.H. 556/28.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

Dated Mysore, ...20th February..... *1929.*

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

TO

N. Madhava Rao, Esq.,B.A.,B.L.,
Chief *Secretary to the Government of*
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

SIR, Suit - Sri Kalikamba Temple - Seringapatam - Management -

---

With reference to letter No.P.410/Law 84-28 dated 2-2-29 received from the Secretary to Government, Law Department, regarding O.S.No.17 of 1928-29 (Nagappachari VS. the Chief Secretary to Government) on the file of the District Judge's Court, Mysore, I have the honor to submit herewith for information a copy of my letter No.H.556/28 dated 20th February 1929, with its enclosure, addressed to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. V. Ananthaman

Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore District.

A.N.

19

No. H.556/28.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

Dated Mysore, ...20th....February..... *192* 9

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

P.G. D' Souza, Esq.,B.A.,B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

SIR,

Suit - Sri Kalikamba Temple - Seringapatam - management.

In continuation of this office letter No.M. 556/28 dated 25th January 1929 regarding the suit O.S.No.17 pf 1928-29 (Nagappachari VS the Chief Secretary to Government) on the file of the District Judge's Court,Mysore, in the matter of the management of the above temple, I have the honor to state that the Public Prosecutor, Mysore Division, had under instructions from the Secretary to Government, Law Department, been asked to appear on behalf of Government in court on 4-2-1929, and requested that the connected records might be sent to him. The Secretary to Government, Law Department also requested in his letter No.P. 410/Law.84-28 dated 2-2-1929 that the connected records might be sent to the Public Prosecutor. Accordingly the records were got back from the Amildar and sent to the Public Prosecutor. He felt some difficulty as to whether he could conduct the defence as he had previously conducted the case on behalf of Nagappachari before the Sub Division Officer, French Rocks, as a private Counsel.

In his recent letter dated 15/16th February 1929 (copy enclosed) he states that there is no legal impediment for his accepting the brief on behalf of Government and solicits instructions in the matter of opposing the plaintiff's application to the Court praying for a temporary injunction restraining the defendant from disturbing the plaintiff's management of the Temple.

3. I have requested the Public Prosecutor to oppose the application on the next date of hearing namely 22nd February 1929.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore District.

A.N.

(Copy)

For Deputy Commr,

Mysore Dt

2 D

Letter No. /28-29 dated 15/16th February 1929, from the Public Prosecutor, Mysore Division, to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.

In continuation of my office letter No.396/28-29 dated 29th/30th January 1929, I have the honor to inform you that after perusal of the records received from you as well as from the Chief Secretary to Government of Mysore, Bangalore, relating to Nagappachari's suit concerning the management of Kalikamba Temple of Seringapatam, I found that there is no legal impendiment for my accepting the brief on behalf of Government in the said suit. I accordingly sent a Vakalatnama to the Chief Secretary for signature and return. The same was received yesterday and it will be filed in court during hearing of this day.

In this connection, I wish to inform you the Plaintiff Nagappachari has filed an application praying for a temporary injunction restraining the defendant from disturbing the plaintiff' management of the temple. Copy of the same is herewith sent to you for perusal and return with your instructions in the matter of opposing the plaintiff's application.

The favour of an early reply is solicited before 22nd instant.

"Copy"

For Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

A.N.

13 3854 928
21.P

WD 546-GPB-50,000-4-9-8

192 8-1929

From

The Public Prosecitor and

Government Pleader, Mysore Divisior

M y s o r e.

To

The Chief Secretary to the

Government of Mysore,

B A N G A L O R E.

Dated 23rd February 1929.

Despatched

Received

General No. 460 / 28-29
No.

Enclosure No. one Statement.

Sir,

I have the honour to send herewith the typed copy of Defence Statement prepared by me in answer to Naggappa Chari suit no: 17/28-29 on the file of the District Judge's Court, Mysore.

If you find the same alright, you will please send it to Law Secretary to Government for his opinion and then after return the same with your signature in places marked thereon.

The case is posted to 28th instant for filing defence after two adjournments. I request therefore that the Statement with your signatures will be returned early.

I wish to inform in this connection that I opposed plaintiff's application for temporary injunction yesterday and the matter is reserved for orders.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

M. Srinivasa Aiyangar
Public Prosecutor & Govt. Pleader

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Leave

File No. 84-28

Serial No. 14

Judl. No. 4827

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

To

The Public Prosecutor.

Mysore.

Date of issue 26/2/29

Signed by M.V.R.S

Sir,

With reference to your letter No: 460/28-29 dated 23rd Feb 1929 addressed to the Chief Secretary to the Govt. regarding the written Statement in O.S. 17 of 28-29 on the file of the District Judge, Mysore, I have the honour to ~~request you to state~~ enquire why you have not followed the procedure ~~prescribed~~ prescribed in rule 93 of the Rules for the Conduct of Legal affairs of

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

Government (G.O. P 4966-5045 Cts 76-23-1, dated 10-19th March 1924), under which the draft written statement has to be submitted by you to the undersigned for approval. I have also to point out that not only have you delayed the submission of the draft till the 24th inst, leaving a margin of ~~hardly~~ about three days only for transmission by post and scrutiny, but you have omitted ~~not~~ forwarded the connected records as required in spite of the requisition contained sent to you in this office letter No: P 4016/Law dated 30th Jan 1929. Under the circumstances I have ~~there~~ you have no option but to request you ~~to move for~~ an adjournment on the 28th instant to file the written statement. ~~and to send~~ in the meanwhile the records may be forwarded ~~the records for facilitating~~ without any further delay ~~Scrutiny of the statement. He~~ ~~with your letter under reply~~

I have ch
2/6/29

Dy Legal Rv + Se

4415 3535/24 P 23

WD 516 –GPB –60,000 –4-9-8

Re- GS No 17/1928-29 (Encroachment)

From Chief Secretary

The Resident Commissioner Gilbert Islands
Tarawa

To The Secretary to Govt of H. H.
The Administrator of Nauru. Secretary
Samoa

Dated 28-2-29

Despatched 28-2-29

Received

General No. 477 of 28-29.
No.

Enclosure No. 2 files & papers

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your communication No 4817 dated 26-2-29 In answer to the above I wish to bring the following facts to your kind consideration. It is true that in your letter No 3909 dated 26-1-29 You wanted me to obtain an extract of the Chief Secretary's No 1/1 of 28-29 (Encroachment of Chief Secretary) on the file of the Crt Judge. Nauru. So I had a recollection that I had obtained for that Resident in case any proceedings connected with that may take I want to satisfy myself if there could be any legal objection for any statement on behalf of the defendant in the suit. So I addressed a letter to the Chief Secretary on 29-1-29 intimating to him my doubts in the matter and requested him to send

of the records in the case. I also took care to [illegible]
the Dy Cmr. Lyons and the S.D.O. Ranchi Rocks to expedite
the despatch of the enclosures & Temp Settlement Case
Diary Officer.

II Application
Vide Dy Cmr's letter No 4016 dated 3.
to send me a file of papers, Letter said letter, I am asked
me to prepare a written statement, as well as objection
to the issue of a temporary injunction prayed for by
the plaintiffs.

III On the 4th of Feb 29 I attended before the Dist Judge's court
for an adjournment. The case was fixed to 11-2-29.
In the intervening period, I submitted my draft written
statement for my perusing the instructions of
Chief Secretary. So on the 11th of Feb 29, I attended before
court and stated that I could obtain the instructions
and state objections to the issue of a temporary injunc
and also file the defence statement in the case.
The case was then adjourned to 15-2-29. On 11-2-29 I sent
Vakalat to the Chief Secretary & requested him to get
the Vakalat, after his signature, along with a copy of
the amended R. & C. Regln No VII of 1927, as I had inadvertently
left the same in my office. The Chief Secretary immediately
returned the Vakalat, duly signed by him & also sent
me a copy of Regln VII of 1927, on 14-2-29.

IV On 15-2-29, I filed the Vakalat in court & obtained time
to state objections to the grant of a temporary injunction.
The case was accordingly fixed to 22-2-29 for argument
being addressed re- the grant or otherwise of a temporary
injunction - As the plaintiffs' counsel was absent &
asked for an order to issue letter by Cmr. Lyons, not to
disturb the plff from the possession & conduct of the
management of the temple, I addressed a demi-official
to the Dy Cmr. Lyons. On 16-2-29 as per my diary No 442,
and asked him what he had to say in answer to the
petitioner's application [illegible] along with the letter - The Dy Cmr.
was planned to send, his letter No 492 dated 20-2-29,
wherein he asked me to oppose the application.

V. Accordingly on the 22nd of Feb 1929, I argued at
great length against the issue of a temporary

temporary injunction, and stated that in as much as the Complete was a Money recoverable action as defined by section 2 of Rule VII of 1927, Court was perfectly competent to act under section 6 & obtain a certificate of Ahmadabad Bar. Further I submitted that the suit was clearly not maintainable as per section 40 of the said Rules & that the suit was clearly time barred. The court was pleased to adjourn the case to the 28th and while doing so asked me if I would send him the records, I had with me, in order to enable him to peruse the two further orders dated 29.7.27 & 2-12-27 referred to by me in the course of my argument. In obedience to the court's request records were sent to the Civil Judge on the 23rd and they were returned to me today, after the pronouncement of the order rejecting the prayer for a temporary injunction. No explanation as to why the records could not be taken along with the draft written statement.

VII As the typed copy of the written statement was not correctly typed, I had to get it retyped on the 23rd. With a view to avoid delay, I sent the typed copy of the W. Statement to the Chief Secretary direct with a request that he might be pleased to send it to you for approval and that after your approval, he be pleased to return it to me, with his signature. Here you will be pleased to observe that I have substantially complied with Rule 23 and I trust the above fact to sufficiently explain the delay you notice.

VIII As desired by you, I send the filed Vakalatnama sent by you along with the file of Vakalatnama received by me from the Govt Counsel Office Bombay. Same may kindly be returned to me, along with the written statement. If the said statement is approved by you, may I request you to be good enough to send the signature of the Chief Secretary in two places, before it is returned to me, as this would obviate avoidable delay. The case is adjourned to 6-8-29 for filing our written statement. I have the honour to be,

Dear Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
The Deputy Legal Adviser &
Political Secretary.

In the Court of the District Judge, Mysore,

O.S.No: 17 of 28-29.

Plaintiff. Defendant.

Nagappa Chari VS. Government of Mysore.

The Chief Secretary on behalf of Government of Mysore begs leave to state as follows:-

I. The temple in question is a Muzrai Institution as defined in Section 2 clause 2 of Regulation VII of 1927.

II. In exercise of the powers vested in Government as the chief controlling authority in all matters connected with Muzrai Institutions. And as the special circumstances and the management of the affairs of the temple and the Inam lands endowed to the temple from Public Revenue demanded the vesting of the control of the temple affairs in a committee consisting of five Dharmadarshis ~~in~~ in lieu of allowing the entire control to vest in one individual, Government, in their orders dated 29-7-27, 2-12-27 directed the appointment of five Dharmadarshis to supervise and manage the affairs of the temple. This order of Government in the matter passed under Section 6 is perfectly legal and final and this Honourable Court has no jurisdiction over the order of Government as per section 40 of Regulation VII of 1927.

III. The allegations made in para 4 of the amended plaint, that the provisions of Chapter III of the Regulation VII of 1927 are applicable to the temple in question and that the order of Government came

within the purview of the provisions contained in the Chapters III &V of Regulation VII of 1927 are incorrect and unsound.

IV. Even granting but not conceding that the plaintiff has the right to file this suit, Government passed orders on the appeal preferred by Mariyachari and others on 29-7-1927. This order came to the knowledge of the plaintiff before 18-8-1927. Plaintiff should have filed the present suit before the lapse of six months from the date of that order and even if the Review Petition and the order passed thereon on 2-12-27 be taken into account, the suit should have been filed within six months from 2-12-27. The allegation in para 7 of the plaint, that the cause of action to file the present suit arose from 4th of October 1928 is incorrect and untenable. The suit is liable to be rejected or dismissed with costs on the ground that it is time barred.

V. As the Deputy Commissioner rightly refused Sanction under Section 92 C.P.C.to enable plaintiff and another to file the present suit, the suit by the present plaintiff alone is not maintainable under Section 40 (A) of Regulation VII of 1927 and also under clause 2 of section 92 C.P.C.

VI. Sonar Rangiah was not in any way clothed with the authority to exercise the powers of a manager in the affairs of the temple. A perusal of the Sannad will make matters clear. As it was Sonar Rangiah that was responsible for moving His Highness the Late Sree Krishnarajendra Wadiyar to endow the temple with Inam lands, Sonar Rangiah naturally assumed control over the affairs of the temple. This continued till 1918, when Government appointed Muzrey Sheristedars to investigate into the working and management of minor Muzrai Institutions. As the result of such investigation, it was found that the management and control of the internal affairs of the temple by the present plaintiff was by no means satisfactory and

was not

in accordance with the wishes of the major section of the devotees of the temple. Accordingly, a proposal to place the temple under the management of a committee was made and this was adopted by the Government. The allegations of plaintiff that he has a hereditary right to manage the affairs of the temple, is not tenable.

For reasons aforesaid amongst others, the Defendant prays that the suit may be dismissed with costs.

X

Facts stated above submitted are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Appendix F G—1

2

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

.....

Section [illegible]

File No. 56-28

Serial No. 11

No. F 4923

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

The Public Prosecutor
Mysore,

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Date of issue..... 5/3/29

Signed by ..... M Puttaiya

Sir,

With reference to your letter No: 477 of 28.29 dated 28th Febr 1929 regarding O.S.I. of 28.29 (Nagarkachari vs Govt) in the District Court Mysore, I have the honour to inform you that the written Statement has been sent today to the Chief Secretary now at Mysore, for favour of Kind Signature & return of the same to you with

st of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

in the connected records

time ~~for~~ the statement ~~being~~ filed to enable you to file the same

Court on 7th March 1929

D Haverock

P M 3

Legal Advisers

In the Court of the District Judge, Bangalore

O.S. 17 of 28.29

Plaintiff — Nagappachari

Deft — Govt.

Under order 8 rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the defendant abovenamed begs to file the following written statement:-

1) The temple in question is a Muzarai institution ~~and as such~~ coming under chapter II of the Regulation VII of 1927 and consequently under Sec 40, this Hon'ble Court has no jurisdiction to try this suit

2). This defendant denies that the temple was either founded or endowed by the ancestors of the plaintiff or that ~~the~~ its management vested in law in ~~the~~ of the family of the plaintiff.

3). The ~~pl~~ defendant is not aware of the registered release deed dated 17.2.10 alleged to have been executed by Puttachari in favour of the plaintiff. Even if true, it cannot convey any rights to the plaintiff, since ~~there~~ in law such a transfer is void and of no effect.

4) The allegations in para 3a of the amended plaint were irrelevant and do not carry the ~~case of the~~ plaintiff's case any further. The decision in the Criminal proceedings mentioned therein ~~are~~ cannot be binding on this defendant.

5). It is true that the Hon'ble Court approved the recommendation of the Deputy Com^r to leave the day to day management of the temple in plaintiffs' hands; but since ~~the Court~~ it was found that such a management was not conducive to the better management of the institution and ~~that~~ it was contrary to the wishes that it was of a fairly large section of the devotees of the temple, Government as the chief Controlling Authority in all matters connected with Hindu institutions, exercised the power vested in them under Sec 6 of Reg VII of 1927 and framed a proper scheme for the future management of the temple. Such an order is final and binding upon the parties and ~~Civil Courts have no~~ cannot be questioned in a Civil Court.

6). This defendant denies emphatically the allegations in para 4 of the amended plaint (para 5 of the original) and submits that Chapter III

of Reg VII of 1927 has no application to the suit temple, since it is a Huzarai Institution as defined in section 2 cl (12)

(7) This defendant submits that section 36 of ~~the~~ Reg VII of 1927 has no application to the facts of this case and even otherwise, no suit in a Civil Court is maintainable for setting aside the orders of Govt passed ~~therein~~ in such matters. ~~of Govt officers.~~

Even if it be held to be maintainable

8). The suit is barred by limitation ~~under~~ under sec 21 of Reg VII of 1927. The plaintiff is not entitled to any exclusion of the period taken by him in prosecuting an application under sec 92 C.P.C before the Deputy Comr.

9). This suit is also not maintainable under section 92 C.P.C since ~~the~~ no ~~Govt refused the~~ ~~requisite to sanction~~ Sanction ~~prayed for~~ has been obtained as required therein.

10). The plaintiff is not entitled to any of the relief claimed and the suit has therefore to be dismissed with Costs.

~~Yours~~

Facts stated above are true to the
best of my knowledge & belief -

P.M.
S.B

Chief Secy

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Date of issue 5/3/29

Signed by M N S

st of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section Law

File No. 84-28

Serial No. 17

No. 4924

Do.

To

N. Madhavarao Esq.
Chief Secretary

Dear Sir,

I have sent here Law file 84 of 1928 regar O.S. 17 of 28-29 on the file of the District Munsif, myself for favour of your kind Signature to the written Statement placed therein As the Case comes off on 7th M 1929 & I therefore request your kindself to arrange to send the Statement with the re in the linked file

over

To the Public Prosecutor,

Nisame ~~[illegible]~~ Tomorrow.

Yours truly

D. M.

'54/3

D.O.

Camp No. 17/CB.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,

Bangalore, 6th March 1929.

(Camp) Mysore.

Dear Mr. Mahadevaiya,

I am returning herewith the Law File 84 of 1928 (re: C.S. 17 of 28-29 on the file of the District Judge, Mysore) received with your D.O. letter No.P.4924 of yesterday's date.

I have sent on to the Public Prosecutor direct, the written statement and records as suggested by you. Draft of the letter sent to him is placed in the file.

Yours sincerely,

To

P. Mahadevaiya, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,
Legal Remembrancer & Law Secretary to Govt.,
Bangalore.

Encl:- (1) Written Statement of Chief Secy
(2) Original & revised plans
(3) one file of original records
(4) Mcj. 7. 22 - 26 - 1902.

32

Mysore
xxxxxxx 6th March 9

Camp No. 15
C.B

From

The Chief Secretary to Govt.

To The Public Prosecutor,
Mysore Division, Mysore.

With reference to correspondence ending with letter No. P. 4923 dated 5th March 1929 from the Secretary to Government, Law Department, to you, I forward herewith the written statement in O.S.17 of 1928-29 (Nagappachari Vs. Government) in the District Court, Mysore. The connected Records also accompany.

Kindly acknowledge receipt.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Chief Secretary to Government.

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE BANGALORE.

O.S. 17 of 1928-29

Plaintiff	Defendant.
Nagappachari	Government.

Under Order 8 rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the defendant above named begs to file the following written statement.:-

1. The temple in question is a Muzrai Institution coming under chapter II of the Regulation VII of 1927 and consequently under Section 40, the Hon'ble Court has no jurisdiction to try this suit.

2. This defendant denies that the temple was either founded or ~~endured~~ endowed by the ancestors of the plaintiff or that its management vested in law in the family of the plaintiff.

3. The defendant is not aware of the registered release deed dated 17th February 1910 alleged to have been executed by Puttachari in favour of the plaintiff. Even if true, it cannot convey any rights to the plaintiff, since in law such a transfer is void and of no effect.

4. The allegations in para 3 (a) of the amended plaint are irrelevant and do not carry the plaintiff's case any further. The decision in the criminal proceedings mentioned therein cannot be binding on this defendant.

5. It is true that the Muzrai Commissioner approved the recommendation of the Deputy Commissioner to leave the sole - management of the temple in plaintiff's hands; but since it was found that such an arrangement was not conducive to the better management of the institution and that it was contrary to the wishes of a fairly large section of the devotees of the temple, Government as the Chief Controlling Authority in all matters - connected with Muzrai institutions, exercised the power vested

in

in them under section 6 of Regulation VII of 1927 and framed a proper scheme for the future management of the temple. Such an order is final and binding upon the parties and cannot be questioned in the Civil Court.

6. The defendant denies emphatically the allegations in para 4 of the amended plaint and para 5 of the original one and submits that chapter III of Regulation VII of 1927 has no application to the suit temple, since it is a Muzrai institution as defined in section 2 clause (2)

7. This defendant submits that section 34 of Regulation VII of 1927 has no application to the facts of this case and even otherwise, no suit in a civil ~~xxxx~~ court is maintainable for setting aside the orders of Government passed in such matters.

8. The suit even if it be held to be maintainable is barred by limitation under section 21 of Regulation VII of 1927. The plaintiff is not entitled to any exclusion of the period taken by him in prosecuting an application under section 92 C.P.C. before the Deputy Commissioner.

9. This suit is also not maintainable under section 92 C.P.C. since no sanction has been obtained as required therein.

10. The plaintiff is not entitled to any of the reliefs claimed and the suit has therefore to be dismissed with costs.

Chief Secretary to Government

Facts stated above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Chief Secretary to Government.